

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on July 10, 2003, has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendments and following remarks are submitted in response thereto. Claims 2, 3, 13, 14 and 25 are canceled, and claims 1, 12, 23 and 24 are amended. Claims 1, 4–12 and 15–24 are pending.

The Examiner rejected the drawings due to typographic errors and illegible numeric labels. Accordingly, FIGS. 3 and 5 have been amended to correct typographic errors, and FIGS. 6, 7 and 8 have been amended to improve the legibility of the numeric labels. Additionally, the Examiner rejected the specification due to various informalities. Accordingly, the specification has been amended to correct the typographic error on page 6, to insert "(step 414)" and "(step 416)" on page 14, to replace step "506" with step "510" on page 15, and, finally, to insert "(step 512)" on page 16. In view of these amendments, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw his objections to the drawings and the specification.

Claims 1, 12, 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,812,769 to Graber et al. ("Graber"). Claims 2, 3, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graber in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,128,279 to O'Neil et al. Claims 4 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graber in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,995,099 to Horstmann et al. ("Horstmann"). Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graber in view of Horstmann and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,052,736 to Ogle et al. Claims 6–8, 17–19 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graber in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,128,279 to Muller et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,321,242 to Fogg et al. ("Fogg"). Claims 9, 10, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graber in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,751,956 to Kirsch et al. Claims 11 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graber in view of Fogg.

In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, the Applicants submit that claims 1, 4–12 and 15–24 are allowable over the cited art, and respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the pending § 102 and § 103 rejections.

Claims 1, 4–12 and 15–24, As Amended, Are Allowable Over the Cited References

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a method for forwarding a web address to another web address in a network and recites, in pertinent part, “receiving a request destined to a first web address including a domain name and a uniform resource identifier (URI),” “determining a forwarding uniform resource locator (URL) that corresponds to the domain name,” “combining the forwarding uniform resource locator (URL) and the uniform resource identifier (URI) to form a second web address” and “redirecting the request to the second web address.” Claims 12, 23 and 24, as amended, are directed to a computer-readable medium, an apparatus and a system, respectively, and recite similar subject matter. The Applicants respectfully submit that the references cited by the Examiner fail to disclose these features.

Graber is directed to a method for redirecting a user from a first location on the world wide web to a second location on the world wide web using relative URL addressing. Graber teaches that a “destination URL” can be formed by replacing the first location’s uniform resource identifier with the second location’s uniform resource identifier without changing the first portion of the current URL, including the domain name. The Applicants submit that Graber is entirely silent on whether a user can be redirected from a first web address to a second web address by replacing the domain name of the first web address with a forwarding uniform resource locator without changing the uniform resource identifier, as recited by claims 1, 12, 23 and 24, as amended.

Specifically, Graber discloses that a current URL, having a “first portion” and a “second portion,” represents the address of the first location, while a “destination URL portion” represents a partial address of the second location. The complete address of the second location, or the “destination URL,” is formed by substituting the “destination URL portion” for the “second portion” of the current URL. Thus, the “destination URL” includes the “first portion” of the first location’s address and the “destination URL portion” of the second location’s partial address. The “destination URL” therefore represents an address that is “relative” to the first location, i.e., relative to the first portion of the first location’s address. *See, e.g.,* Col. 3, lines 15–34; Col. 11, lines 24–32; Col. 14 line 52 to Col. 15 line 7; etc.

Graber teaches that the current URL’s “first portion” corresponds to the home page address of a web site (e.g., “www.ols.com”, which includes the domain name “ols.com”), while the current URL’s “second portion” corresponds to a specific page at that site (e.g.,

".../Info/Info.P1"), also known as a uniform resource identifier (or URI). The "destination URL portion" corresponds to another specific page at that site (e.g., ".../Enroll/Enroll.P1"), or another uniform resource identifier (or URI). *See*, Col. 11, lines 24–32; FIG. 5. Graber's "redirect.cgi" program redirects the user from the first location to the second location by stripping the ".../Info/Info.P1" portion off of the current URL and replacing it with the ".../Enroll/Enroll.P1" portion to form the "destination URL." In other words, Graber teaches that the "destination URL" is formed by replacing the first location's uniform resource identifier with the second location's uniform resource identifier without changing the first portion of the current URL, including the domain name.

The Applicants submit that Graber is entirely silent on whether a user can be redirected from a first web address to a second web address by replacing the domain name of the first web address with a forwarding uniform resource locator without changing the uniform resource identifier, as recited by claims 1, 12, 23 and 24, as amended. Referring to the Specification for an example, the first web address "www.joe-domain.com/section3/user1.html" consists of the domain name "joe-domain.com" and the uniform resource identifier "/section3/user1.html" (Page 15, lines 12–14). If a corresponding forwarding uniform resource locator is determined to be "www.geocities.com/members/joe," then this forwarding uniform resource locator may be combined with the uniform resource identifier to form the second web address "www.geocities.com/members/joe/section3/user1.html" (Page 16, lines 9–13). The Applicants submit that neither Graber, nor any of the other references cited by the Examiner, teach or suggest these features, either singly or in combination.

Accordingly, claims 1, 12, 23 and 24 are allowable over the cited references. Claims 4–11, depending from claim 1, and claims 15–22, depending from claim 12, are also allowable, at least for the reasons discussed above. Consequently, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the pending § 102 and § 103 rejections.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks submitted above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the present case is in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect would be greatly appreciated.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 220-4294 to discuss any matter concerning this application.


The Office is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

October 10, 2003

By:


Adam M. Treiber (Reg. No. 48,000)

1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 220-4200 (phone)
(202) 220-4201 (fax)

DC:469014_1.DOC